

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/632,844	08/04/2003	Toshi Sacki	SUG-017-USA-P	5062	
27955 TOWNSEND &	7590 02/07/200 & BANTA	1	EXAMINER		
c/o PORTFOLI	IO IP		HUSON, MONICA ANNE		
PO BOX 52050 MINNEAPOLI	-		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		1732		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MO	NTHS	02/07/2007	PAI	PER	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	4
	10/632,844	SAEKI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Monica A. Huson	1732	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence addre	ss
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a red d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ate, cause the application to become AB	CATION.  eply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this commu  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Statu <b>s</b>			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21	December 2006.		
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Th	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	·	• •	erits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)  Claim(s) 10-12 and 14-19 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-19 is/are withdrays 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 10-12 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 04 August 2003 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ obj e drawing(s) be held in abeyand ction is required if the drawing(	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1	, ,
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat*  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received.  Its have been received in Apporting to the property or the property of the property o	oplication No received in this National Sta	ge
Attachment(s)  I)   Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Si	ummary (PTO-413)	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)	/Mail Date formal Patent Application	

Application/Control Number: 10/632,844

Art Unit: 1732

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

This office action is in response to the RCE/Amendment filed 4 December 2006.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless – (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bielfeldt (U.S. Patent 3,464,091). Regarding Claim 10, Bielfeldt shows that it is known to carry out an injection molding method (Abstract; it is noted that "low pressure" is a subjective limitation that can be interpreted broadly to include any number of ranges relative to other ranges), said method comprising moving an injection portion along a line of a plurality of vertically disposed resin supplying ports in communication with a cavity, while injecting molten resin from the injection portion into the vertically disposed resin supplying ports, so as to fill the cavity with molten resin via a plurality of injections (Figures 4-5, element 4a', 8a'; Column 4, lines 1-37), wherein the molten resin is sequentially injected into the resin supplying ports at low injection pressure by moving the injection portion from one vertically disposed resin supplying port to the next vertically disposed resin supplying port, thereby injecting molten resin to all vertically disposed resin supplying ports in a sequential manner (Column 4, lines 7-22; it is noted that "low pressure" is a subjective limitation that can be interpreted broadly to include any number of ranges relative to other ranges).

Application/Control Number: 10/632,844

Art Unit: 1732

Regarding Claim 11, Bielfeldt shows the process as claimed as discussed in the rejection of Claim 10 above, including a method wherein, during injection of the molten resin into the cavity, said injection portion moves from a vertically disposed resin supplying port disposed at a low elevation end of the line of a plurality of vertically disposed resin supplying ports, to a vertically disposed resin supplying port disposed at an upper elevation end of the plurality of vertically disposed resin supplying ports (Column 4, lines 18-27; when the nozzle is finished with 8a', it moves upward to align itself with the next 7a' which arrives after rotation of the turntable).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bielfeldt, in view of Makinson et al. (U.S. Patent 4,124,343). Bielfeldt shows the process as claimed as discussed in the rejection of Claim 10 above, including a method wherein, upon termination of injection of the molten resin at the one resin supplying port, said injection portion moves to the next resin supplying port in the line of plurality of resin supplying ports (Column 1, lines 61-67; Column 2, lines 44-50). Bielfeldt does not specifically show using a detection sensor in the cavity. Makinson shows that it is known to carry out a method wherein the injection of said molten resin from said injection portion to one resin supplying port is terminated by a detection sensor in communication with the injection portion and disposed in a predetermined position of said cavity for detecting a charging amount of the molten resin (Column 5, lines 3-

Application/Control Number: 10/632,844 Page 4

Art Unit: 1732

29; Column 8, lines 31-46). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Makinson's sensor during Bielfeldt's molding method in order to avoid overfilling or underfilling of the mold cavity.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-12 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The examiner notes that the claim does not necessarily require a plurality of ports in communication with a *single* cavity.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monica A. Huson whose telephone number is 571-272-1198. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on 571-272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/632,844 Page 5

Art Unit: 1732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Monica A Huson

February 1, 2007